

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schou (WO 01/15977) in view of Shanton (US 5,776,619). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the applied references teaches or renders obvious a cover for a block carton that includes a first surface having a first coating that is essentially impermeable to water vapor and a second surface is have a second coating that has a large number of comparatively small pinhole openings. The Office Action admits that Schou lacks a coating of water-based varnish. The Office Action asserts that Shanton remedies the deficiency by disclosing plate stock comprising a water-based varnish coating. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Schou's block carton to include a varnish coating in order to make the carton impervious to grease and oil. Applicants respectively disagree.

While Shanton discloses the use of water-based varnish for coating one surface of plate stock, the purpose of providing this coating to one surface of the cardboard is to improve grease and oil resistance on the paperboard surface facing, e.g., foodstuff contained in the cardboard container. By having the varnish coating on the surface of the cardboard facing the foodstuff, this coating provides a barrier and hence the cardboard is not soaked with grease or oil.

The above-described arrangement disclosed by Shanton is completely contrary to the currently claimed arrangement. Specifically, Applicants combine the use of a surface having a coating with pinholes on one side and a water-based varnish on the other side. This allows controlled absorption of vapor or liquid from the foodstuff in the cardboard by having the

surface with pinholes facing the foodstuff, and at the time the outer surface with the water-based varnish coating will form a barrier for the vapor or liquid. This arrangement is completely opposite to that of Shanton. Indeed, Shanton teaches away from the presently claimed arrangement by going to great lengths to prevent moisture from reaching a side facing away from the foodstuff in the container, i.e., the varnish coating is used to provide a complete barrier. Contrarily, the presently claimed arrangement allows for a controlled absorption of vapor or liquid from one side of the plate stock to the other.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Shanton fails to supply the admitted deficiencies of Schou and therefore Schou, either alone or in combination with Shanton does not render obvious claims 1-25. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Richard A. Castellano
Registration No. 61,961

JAO:RAC/rle

Date: November 26, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--